DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 370 439 FL 022 220

AUTHOR Takahashi, Satomi; DuFon, Margaret A.
TITLE Cross-Linguistic Influence in Indirectness: The Case of English Directives Performed by Native Japanese Speakers.
PUB DATE Dec 89
NOTE 45p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Cross Cultural Studies; *English (Second Language); *Japanese; *Language Proficiency; *Linguistic Borrowing; Questionnaires; Role Playing; *Second Language Learning; Socioeconomic Status; Speech Communication; *Young Adults
IDENTIFIERS *Directive Speech

ABSTRACT

This study examined the nature of language transfer and its role in second language acquisition. Nine Japanese female young adults residing in Honolulu, divided into through groups based on English language proficiency, took part in two role playing situations with an American native speaker of English. The subjects were to attempt to get a higher-status neighbor to comply with a request directive. Immediately following the role play, the subjects were interviewed, in Japanese, about the situations. The results were then compared to earlier data on Japanese and American directive speech. The results indicated that Japanese learners of English as a Second Language (ESL) tended to proceed from less direct to more direct levels in their directive choice. This is the opposite of the sequence of development in native English-speaking children, which proceeds from more direct to less direct. This finding suggests that other factors besides transfer appear to be influencing the directive choice. The study also found that the beginning group took longer to complete the task, and had more difficulty with it, than either the intermediate or advanced group of ESL learners. Three appendixes contain a taxonomy of directness and indirectness, copies of the role play situations in Japanese and English, and a student general background questionnaire. Contains 44 references. (MDM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 370 439

CROSS-LINGUISTIC INFLUENCE IN INDIRECTNESS: THE CASE OF ENGLISH DIRECTIVES PERFORMED BY NATIVE JAPANESE SPEAKERS

by

Satomi Takahashi & Margaret A. DuFon

Manuscript

Department of English as a Second Language

University of Hawaii at Manoa

December, 1989

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Satomi Takahashi

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

FL022220

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INTRODUCTION

The nature of transfer and its role in second language acquisition have long been controversial issues. In the 1950s and 1960s, transfer from L1 to L2 played a central role in explicating the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis (CAH), which was supported by Banathy, Trager, and Waddle (1966), Stockwell, Bowen, and Martin (1965), Wardhaugh (1970), and others. In the 1970s, however, many SLA researchers (Dulay & Burt, 1974; Hyltenstam, 1977; and others) provided counter-evidence against the CAH, claiming that learners' errors were seen not as evidence of language transfer or "restructuring" L1 knowledge but of a process of "creative construction" (see Ellis, 1985; Larsen-Freeman & Long, in press). In recent years, the role of transfer has been reassessed from different perspectives, and more powerful and persuasive evidence for language transfer has been presented by many SLA researchers (Eckman, 1977; Gass & Selinker, 1983; Kean, 1984; Kellerman, 1977, 1978, 1984; Kellerman & Sharwood Smith, 1986; Zobl, 1982; and others). They support the view that cross-linguistic influence can be a major force in elucidating the process of second language acquisition.

This recent view is particularly supported by the SLA researchers who have been engaged in the study of the social dimensions of transfer. Most of those researchers have examined transfer into the L2 context of L1 sociolinguistic interactional rules within the framework of speech act theory: requests (Blum-Kulka, 1982; Faerch & Kasper, 1989; Kasper, 1989), refusals (Beebe, Takahashi, & Uliss-Weltz, 1985), apologies (Cohen & Olshtain, 1981; Olshtain, 1983), and gratitude (Eisenstein & Bodman, 1986). Currently, the rationale for study in this area of transfer (usually referred to as sociolinguistic/pragmatic transfer) is to provide information for developing L2 communicative competence of second language learners through the investigation into the acquisition of knowledge about the performance of a given speech act in the second language.

On the whole, all of the studies of sociolinguistic/ pragmatic transfer referred to above traced L1 transfer into the

L2 context when second language learners performed given speech acts in their target languages. Among them, Blum-Kulka (1982) found relatively systematic L1 transfer in indirectness manifested in L2 directives and thus provides us with some insight into the significant role of the L1 in second language learning.[1]

Based on Morgan (1978), Blum-Kulka hypothesized that the nature of interdependence between "conventions of language" and "conventions about the use of language (acceptability)" might vary systematically across languages although the social rationale of indirectness is based on universal principles, as claimed by Brown and Levinson (1978, 1987). Then, specifically focusing on "conventional indirect directives" discussed in Searle (1975) (e.g., "Can you pass the salt?" or "I would like you to go now," p.65), Blum-Kulka compared indirect strategies or indirectness exemplified in directives performed by native English speakers (L1 - control group), native Hebrew speakers (target L1 - control group), and English learners of Hebrew (L2 - experimental group) using 17-item discourse completion tests. The results confirmed the above hypothesis on "conventions of use." Evidence for the transfer of L1 sociolinguistic norms regarding indirectness was also presented. First, in any given context, learners deviated from the usage of native speakers in performing directives by using a form which was not the one judged to be the most acceptable by native speakers in given situations. Second, in performing directives, native English speakers were less direct than native Hebrew speakers; and English learners of Hebrew followed the same pattern of less directness as represented by their L1 (English) control group. Blum-Kulka then concluded that "the interlanguage of speech act realization is clearly influenced by transfer of social norms from the first language and culture, but that this factor interacts with second language learning acquisition processes in determining the speech act realization of learners" (p.45).

In Blum-Kulka (1982) above, it was found that both native English speakers and English learners of Hebrew tended to take a more indirect approach than Hebrew native speakers in performing

indirect directives. In terms of degree of directness, however, Takahashi (1987) demonstrated that Japanese speakers are more indirect than (American) English native speakers in performing directives in their L1s.[2] She claimed that this tendency could be explained by the different sociolinguistic norms of Japanese and Americans with respect to indirectness. It would follow then that when Japanese learners of English perform English directives, their interlanguages of directive realization might be predicted to be influenced by transfer of Japanese sociolinguistic norms with respect to indirectness, i.e., the apparent greater degree of indirectness in Japanese than in English.

The aims of Takahashi (1987) were twofold: (1) to establish a taxonomy for the use of classifying each directive act performed by Americans and Japanese in terms of its level of indirectness; and (2) to examine the distinctive characteristics of indirectness manifested in L1 directive speech acts performed by those native speakers. It was hoped that the results of the study could subsequently be used as a base for conducting a study of transfer of indirectness exemplified in English directives performed by Japanese speakers.

In so doing, Takahashi first defined "indirect directives" based on the indirect speech act theory, specifically with a focus on Leech's (1980, 1983) Tact Maxim theory, which claims a positive correlation between tact and indirectness as follows:

> "Indirect Directives are the illocutionary acts by which the speaker attempts to get the hearer to take some action beneficial to the speaker him-/herself while realizing the distance between what the speaker literally says and what he/she pragmatically means, i.e. indirectness, which is chiefly motivated by the speaker's desire to avoid conflict with the hearer. The realization of that distance is specifically made by means of the speaker's tact in giving the hearer certain options in response to the speaker's conflict avoidance strategy; and the types of option in response determine the degree of indirectness, the systematic whole of which is eventually characterized by a scalar phenomenon." (Takahashi, 1987, p. 66).

Based on the above definition, Takahashi constructed a comprehensive taxonomy with thirteen levels of indirectness, which

covered both "conventional indirect directives" and "non-conventional indirect directives (i.e., Hints)." (See Appendix A) Data were then elicited through two-party role play situations, experimentally controlled and specifically constructed to maximize the elicitation of directives.

Takahashi's descriptive analyses revealed the above-mentioned tendency in indirectness, i.e., Japanese native speakers employed a more indirect approach in performing directives than Americans. To be more specific, Japanese speakers favored indirect directives with "implicit reference to the requested action," which is known as "Hints" or "non-conventional indirect directives." On the other hand, American English speakers relied on the use of indirect directives with "explicit reference to the action to be taken," which categorically belong to the "conventional indirect directives" mentioned earlier.

By using the L1 Japanese and American English directives obtained in Takahashi (1987) as the baseline data, the present study attempts to investigate the *communicative deviations in indirectness* made by Japanese learners of English when performing English directives and the *influence of Japanese sociolinguistic norms with respect to indirectness* in their speech act realization. Furthermore, since none of the studies of sociolinguistic/pragmatic transfer reviewed above traced the development of L2 learners either cross-sectionally or longitudinally, an attempt will also be made to examine the development in indirectness toward the target language made by those learners at three levels of proficiency in performing directives.

In order to conclusively sort out what is due to cross-linguistic influence and what is due to universal processes of development, however, the comparison of the elicited data with the features of L1 English acquisition of directives will also be attempted. Specifically, it was noted consistently that the proportion of indirect directives with politeness markers is increased with an increase in age and corresponding improvements in linguistic, social, and cognitive abilities (Camras, Pristo &

Brown, 1985; Ervin-Tripp & Guo, in press; Ervin-Tripp, Strage, Lampert, & Bell, 1987; Garvey, 1975; Liebling, 1988; Nippold, Leonard & Anastopoulos, 1982; Read & Cherry, 1978). If our findings are consistent with these L1 developmental features, then we cannot conclusively claim the occurrence of transfer of "L1 sociolinguistic interactional rules."

In order to conclusively claim evidence of transfer, it might also be advisable for us to compare our data with the interlanguage behavior of speakers at different levels of proficiency from very different L1 groups who are acquiring the same L2. However, due to a lack of such data, this comparison will not be pursued, but rather will be an area for future research.

Two research questions are posited:

1) Is there any difference in indirectness (as defined by Takahashi, 1987) in Japanese L1 and English L2 directives performed by Japanese learners at beginning, intermediate and advanced levels of ESL?

2) How do Japanese learners of English deviate from English norms when realizing indirectness in performing English directives at three levels of proficiency?

Based on the results of Takahashi (1987) (i.e., Japanese are more indirect than Americans in performing L1 directives) and the findings from Ervin-Tripp, Strage, Lampert, and Bell (1987), Garvey (1974) and others (i.e., the proportion of indirect directives is increased with an increase in age and corresponding improvement in linguistic abilities), the following two hypotheses will be tested:

1) If universal principles of developmental sequences found in L1 English directive acquisition are dominant in interlanguage pragmatics, early learners of English will be more direct in their directive realizations than learners at more advanced levels.

2) If L1 transfer is a stronger force in interlanguage pragmatics than universal sequences, then early learners of English will be more indirect in their directive realization than learners at more advanced levels.

METHOD

Subjects

Since the L1 Japanese and American English directives data obtained by Takahashi (1987) were used as the baseline data for identifying L1 transfer, only experimental group subjects were needed for the present study. Those subjects were selected so that they could be compared with the Japanese and American subjects in Takahashi (1987) in terms of age, sex, and educational background. The subjects in this study were, then, nine female Japanese students residing in Honolulu ranging in age from 19 to 24 (mean age 21). Those subjects were divided into three groups based on English proficiency: three advanced level subjects from the UH-ELI program (mean TOEFL score = 590), three intermediate level subjects from the UH-ELI program (mean TOEFL score = 534), and three beginning level subjects from the NICE program.[3]

Instruments

As was the case in Takahashi (1987), a method of two-party role play was employed. The validity of role play, i.e., whether it reflects "real" communication is attested to by Ladousse (1987). Ladousse is primarily interested in the use of role play for pedagogical purposes and claims that, in a role play, language learners have direct experience with the unpredictable nature of language use. Boggs (1985), an anthropologist, noted that the verbal routines used by children in their enactment of a role in playing house clearly derived from those used by their parents in real life. Hence, we contend that a role play procedure provides us with data which approximate "real" verbal behavior.

Furthermore, the rationale for using data elicited through role play, instead of naturalistically gathered data, is that only through role play is there a reasonable chance of controlling a number of variables which can affect the degree of indirectness of the performed directives but which are not the focus of the study (Takahashi, 1987). In fact, variables such as the relative status of the hearer, the relative age, the sex of the interlocutors (Fraser, Rintell, & Walters, 1980), familiarity between the

interlocutors and the message itself (Cohen & Olshtain, 1981) would be considered to affect the degree of indirectness to a great extent. Unless those variables are held constant, the resulting data will be confounded and conclusions will not be able to be drawn regarding indirectness. Furthermore, rejecting the use of written discourse completion tests was motivated by the claim that the actual production is often different from the perceived speech behavior (Labov, 1966; Blom & Gumperz, 1972; Wolfson, 1989). Additionally, it is very hard to say that written responses are representative of spoken ones (Wolfson, Marmor, & Jones, 1989; see also Eisenstein & Bodman, 1986).

Two role play situations constructed by Takahashi (1987) were used with some minor modifications, such as changing the proper nouns used, to establish cross-cultural (Japanese vs. Americans) interactions. The situations were described for the subjects in both Japanese and English to ensure that the subjects understood the task and to provide them with the basic vocabulary in English needed to perform the role play. Since only the directives with the same directive intent were comparable, two situations for a requestor were constructed so as to maximally elicit the indirect directives with similar types of directive intent across the data. In both situations, a requestor attempted to get a not-so-familiar neighbor with higher social status/rank to do something.[4] Specifically, in Situation 1, the subject was required to ask the requestee to take some action against the night-time violin practice of her daughter. In Situation 2, the subject was told to ask the counterpart to fill out and return the questionnaire that had previously been requested. The corresponding two situations for a requestee were constructed eliciting similar types of "excuses" for not carrying out the action across the data. It was hoped that other directives might be elicited from the requestor that could also be compared in terms of their degree of indirectness. (See Appendix B)

Procedures

One of the two investigators, a native speaker of American English, participated in the role play as the sole requestee so as not to confound the data with variability stemming from the use of more than one requestee. In order to eliminate the effects of practice as a confounding variable on the part of the requestee, a trial role play was first practiced with a female graduate student who was not a subject of the study. The investigators then met the nine subjects in an order counterbalanced according to proficiency (Advanced-Intermediate-Beginning; Intermediate-Beginning-Advanced; Beginning-Advanced-Intermediate). All the data were collected at the Center for Second Language Classroom Research on the University of Hawaii Manoa Campus.

The subject was asked to read the first situation. The research purpose was not clarified to the subject in order to prevent her conscious performance from affecting the indirectness of the directives. The investigators subsequently conducted the role play, which was audiotaped. The same procedure was repeated for the second situation.

Immediately following the role play, one of the investigators, a native Japanese speaker, interviewed the subject in Japanese. Using an on-the-spot playback technique, the Japanese investigator and the subject reviewed the role play, and the directives were identified based on the informant's judgment. The intent of each directive was also checked here. The interview was also audiotaped. After the interview, general background information on the subject was obtained through a questionnaire. (See Appendix C) The role play data were then transcribed following the transcription procedure used by Takahashi (1987).

Data Analysis

As mentioned earlier, the identification of directives in the data was done based on the informants' judgment. Although doubt has been cast upon the reliance on the judgment of linguistically naive subjects in terms of the validity of this type of task, there is evidence that the directive category of "hints" (or those

in Indirect Level 2) cannot be identified satisfactorily on the basis of linguistic data alone due to the lack of "conventional" forms. In fact, Beebe and Takahashi (1989) show how difficult it is to identify "hints" by citing a case reported by an American woman married to a Japanese man as to their "biggest" communication problem between them: "He sees hints (and acts on them!) where she means off-hand statements" (p.118). In addition, the agreement in the task of identification of directives other than "hints" between the linguistically trained investigators and the subjects reached 90%, which was very close to the agreement between the two investigators for those directives, 100%. Consequently, in this study, the directive identification was primarily based on the subjects' judgment. But in order to give reasonable validity to the task of directive identification, except in the case of "hints" (or those in Indirect Level 2), the expressions judged by both investigators as directives but not reported by the subjects were also included in our present corpus of directives.

Then, an attempt was made to classify the identified directives into the appropriate levels of indirectness in the taxonomy developed by Takahashi (1987). This taxonomy yields three major levels of indirectness: (1) Direct Directives (i.e., imperatives); (2) Indirect Level 1 (Explicit Reference to the Desired Action, i.e., those known as "conventional" indirect directives); and (3) Indirect Level 2 (Implicit Reference to the Desired Action i.e., those known as "hints" or "non-conventional" indirect directives). Each of these major levels consists of one or more sub-levels. Following Leech (1980, 1983), each indirect level is determined in terms of optionality in response available to the hearer, which is embodied in the "forms" of directives (e.g., "Sentences asking H's [=hearer's] ability to do A [= action]" as Level 1.4).[5] (See Appendix A) In order to establish inter-rater reliability, 20 directives were randomly selected and then coded independently by two investigators using the taxonomy. A 90% level of agreement was achieved.

Three data analyses were undertaken for these coded directives following, again, Takahashi (1987). First, in order to get a general picture of the relative indirectness of the directives performed by the subjects, all directives, regardless of directive intent, were categorized. Frequencies were tabulated in both total numbers and in percentages (Analysis 1). Second, between group comparisons were made focusing on the directives attempted first by the subjects with the same directive intent (Analysis 2). Third, between group comparisons were attempted using directives performed after the requestee's pre-directed "excuse" for not implementing the requested action (Analysis 3). For Analysis 2 and Analysis 3, only those directives having the same directive intent were used for the purpose of comparison. Note that Takahashi (1987) determined the similarity of directive intent by using the notions of shared expectations and cost/benefit analysis.[6]

In the three analyses, the data for each group were compared with the data of the L1 source and target languages which were obtained in Takahashi (1987). The data were further compared with the child native speaker acquisition findings of Ervin-Tripp, Strage, Lampert, and Bell (1987), Garvey (1975), and others. The data were not submitted to statistical analysis in this study because of the small sample size.

RESULTS

For Analysis 1, all the directives from each group were coded. They are listed in Tables 1 and 2 for each situation according to level of directness, regardless of directive intent, along with the L1 American English and L1 Japanese groups.

These tables were then examined for patterns. The three ESL groups were compared to each other, to the Japanese L1 controls and the American English L1 controls. For Analysis 1, the percentage of Indirect Level 1 responses increased with

Table 1

Frequencies of Directives Classified into Each Level of Indirectness (Situation 1)

• { } = % within Indirect Levels

Level	Americans			Japanese			Japanese - ESL								
							Beginning			Intermediate			Advanced		
Direct Directives	Freq.	Total Freq.	(%)	Freq.	Total Freq.	(%)	Freq.	Total Freq.	(%)	Freq.	Total Freq.	(%)	Freq.	Total Freq.	(%)
0.0	1	1	(5)	0	0	(0)	0	0	(0)	0	0	(0)	0	0	(0)
Indirect Level 1															
1.1	0			3			1			2			3		
1.2	3			0			1			2			0		
1.3	0			a: 0			2			0			3		
				b: 3											
		15	(75)		12	(48)		12	(92)		13	(93)	1	9	(100)
1.4	1		{79}•	1		{48}	2		{92}	2		{93}	0		{100}
1.5	0			0			1			0			0		
1.6	0			0			0			0			0		
1.7	2			2			2			3			2		
1.8	5			2			0			2			0		
1.9	4			1			3			2			0		
Indirect Level 2															
2.1	1			a: 1			0			0			0		
				b: 4											
2.2.1-1	0	4	(20)	1	13	(52)	0	1	(8)	0	1	(7)	0	0	(0)
2.2.1-2	3		{21}	7		{52}	1		{8}	1		{7}	0		{0}
2.2.2	0			0			0			0			0		
Total	20	20		25	25		13	13		14	14		9	9	

Table 2

• { } = % within Indirect Levels

Frequencies of Directives Classified

into Each Level of Indirectness (Situation 2)

Level	Americans			Japanese			Japanese - ESL								
							Beginning			Intermediate			Advanced		
Direct Directives	Freq.	Total Freq.	(%)	Freq.	Total Freq.	(%)	Freq.	Total Freq.	(%)	Freq.	Total Freq.	(%)	Freq.	Total Freq.	(%)
0.0	0	0	(0)	0	0	(0)	0	0	(0)	1	1	(7)	0	0	(0)
Indirect Level 1															
1.1	0			4			4			3			3		
1.2	1			0			0			0			1		
1.3	1			a: 0			2			0			0		
				b: 2											
1.4	2			1			2			2			1		
1.5	1	15	(56)	0	9	(26)	0	8	(67)	0	9	(64)	0	6	(75)
1.6	0		{56}	0		{26}	0		{67}	0		{69}	0		{75}
1.7	2			0			0			0			1		
1.8	2			2			0			3			0		
1.9	6			0			0			1			0		
Indirect Level 2															
2.1	2			a: 0			1			1			1		
				b: 9											
2.2.1-1	2	12	(44)	6	26	(74)	1	4	(33)	3	4	(29)	1	2	(25)
2.2.1-2	8		{44}	11		{74}	2		{33}	0		{31}	0		{25}
2.2.2	0			0			0			0			0		
Total	27	27		35	35		12	12		14	14		8	8	

proficiency. However, since these percentages for the three experimental groups all fell within a range of 92-100% for Situation 1 and 67-75% for Situation 2, it is unlikely that these differences are significant. All ESL groups were more direct than the Japanese L1 controls, which would support the transfer hypothesis and not support the universal developmental sequences hypothesis. However, all ESL groups were also more direct than the American controls as well, which would indicate that something other than transfer is operating here. It should also be noted that the Beginning ESL group was more like the American group in terms of percentage of correct responses, but more like the Japanese in terms of the bimodal distribution pattern for the degree of directness in Situation 2, i.e., they were either very direct (1.1 - 1.4) or very indirect (2.1 - 2.2.1-2). The distribution of the degree of directness for the intermediate and advanced groups ran along the entire continuum as it did for the Americans.

In Analysis 2, the first directive used by each subject was examined for directive intent. Only those first directives with comparable directive intent were selected. For Situation 1, the directive intent used most frequently by the two L1 groups and the three ESL groups was, "The daughter should practice violin at another time of day." For Situation 2, the most frequent directive intent was, "The businesswoman should return the questionnaire as soon as possible." The directives with the same directive intent were then listed in Tables 3 and 4 for each situation by subject according to levels of directness. For Situation 2, only six of the nine first directives were listed because the other three did not meet the criteria for comparability.

A similar pattern to Analysis 1 Situation 2 was revealed for Analysis 2 Situation 1 with the beginners most similar to the Japanese controls with a bimodal distribution pattern, and the Advanced group the most direct. For Situation 2, both the American and Japanese controls only produced Indirect Level 2

Table 3

Indirect Levels of Performed Directive Acts in Analysis 2
(Situation 1)

	American English		Japanese		Japanese - ESL					
					Beginning		Intermediate		Advanced	
	Directives Performed by:	Level	Directives Performed by:	Level	Directives Performed by:	Level	Directives Performed by:	Level	Directives Performed by:	Level
Direct Directives										
Indirect Level 1			Subject M	1.1					Subject Y	1.1
			Subject L	1.3	Subject S	1.3			Subject X	1.3
	Subject A	1.7			Subject R	1.4	Subject T	1.4	Subject W	1.4
	Subject B	1.8								
	Subject C	1.8					Subject V	1.8		
	Subject D	1.8								
	Subject F	1.8								
	Subject G	1.9								
Indirect Level 2	Subject E	2.1	Subject I	2.1						
			Subject J	2.1						
			Subject P	2.1						
	Subject H	2.2.1-2	Subject K	2.2.1-2	Subject Q	2.2.1-2	Subject U	2.2.1-2		
			Subject N	2.2.1-2						
			Subject O	2.2.1-2						

NOTE: American Subjects = Subject A - Subject H (8)
Japanese Subjects = Subject I - Subject P (8)
Japanese - ESL Subjects = Subject Q - Subject Y (9)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 4

Indirect Levels of Performed Directive Acts in Analysis 2

(Situation 2)

	American English		Japanese		Japanese - ESL					
					Beginning		Intermediate		Advanced	
	Directives Performed by:	Level	Directives Performed by:	Level	Directives Performed by:	Level	Directives Performed by:	Level	Directives Performed by:	Level
Direct Directives										
Indirect Level 1					Subject Q	1.4			Subject Y	1.1
Indirect Level 2	Subject E	2.1	Subject I	2.1			Subject U	2.1		
	Subject G	2.1	Subject L	2.1			Subject T	2.1		
			Subject M	2.1						
			Subject P	2.1						
	Subject A	2.2.1-1								
	Subject B	2.2.1-2	Subject J	2.2.1-2	Subject S	2.2.1-2	Subject V	2.2.1-2		
	Subject C	2.2.1-2	Subject K	2.2.1-2						
	Subject D	2.2.1-2	Subject N	2.2.1-2						
			Subject O	2.2.1-2						

directives. For the ESL groups, however, only the intermediate group produced indirect directives. The two beginners were split between Indirect Level 1 (1.4) and Indirect Level 2 (2.2.1-2). Comparable data from only one advanced subject was available; she was very direct (1.1). In Situation 2, then, the advanced subjects were the most direct and the least like the Japanese controls. As in Analysis 1, they also surpassed the American controls in degree of directness, suggesting that while transfer appears to be operative, other factors appear to be influencing the realization of the directives as well.

In Analysis 3, the first directives after the excuse were compared. Not all the directives were compared, but only those following the same excuse type and with the same directive intent. For Situation 1, the most common excuse type was, "My daughter cannot begin to practice until about eleven o'clock because she is busy with after school activities until around 8:00," and the directive intent of the following directive was "The daughter should change the time of the practice." For Situation 2, the excuse type was, "The woman had been extremely busy working at the bank for the last two weeks and would not be able to fill out the questionnaire for one more week due to expected overtime work." The directive intent of the following directive was, "The businesswoman should fill out the questionnaire as soon as possible." The directives which met these criteria for comparability were then listed in Tables 5 and 6 using the same format as for Tables 3 and 4. Seven of the nine directives in Situation 1, and eight of the nine in Situation 2 were comparable.

No differences were found among the three ESL groups for Situation 1. All performed similarly to the Americans and differently from the Japanese. For Situation 2, the Beginning ESL group performed most similarly to the Japanese controls, with a bimodal distribution pattern; and the Advanced ESL group was the most direct. The two advanced subjects were more direct than the American subject, but since comparable data was available from only one American subject, a clear pattern could not be

Table 5

Indirect Levels of Performed Directive Acts in Analysis 3
(Situation 1)

	American English		Japanese		Japanese - ESL					
					Beginning		Intermediate		Advanced	
	Directives Performed by:	Level	Directives Performed by:	Level	Directives Performed by:	Level	Directives Performed by:	Level	Directives Performed by:	Level
Direct Directives	Subject H	0.0								
Indirect Level 1	Subject H	1.2			Subject R	1.2	Subject T	1.2		
					Subject S	1.3			Subject X	1.3
	Subject B	1.4								
	Subject C	1.7			Subject Q	1.7	Subject V	1.7	Subject W	1.7
Indirect Level 2			Subject L	2.1.1						
	Subject E	2.2.1-2	Subject K	2.2.1-2						
			Subject P	2.2.1-2						

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 6

Indirect Levels of Performed Directive Acts in Analysis 3
(Situation 2)

	American English		Japanese		Japanese - ESL					
					Beginning		Intermediate		Advanced	
	Directives Performed by:	Level	Directives Performed by:	Level	Directives Performed by:	Level	Directives Performed by:	Level	Directives Performed by:	Level
Direct Directives										
Indirect Level 1			Subject K	1.1	Subject R	1.1	Subject T	1.1	Subject Y	1.1
			Subject N	1.1	Subject S	1.1				
			Subject O	1.3.2						
			Subject J	1.4						
									Subject X	1.7
	Subject G	1.9					Subject V	1.8		
Indirect Level 2							Subject U	2.2.1-1		
			Subject I	2.2.1-2	Subject Q	2.2.1-2				
			Subject M	2.2.1-2						

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

determined. These findings again provide some support for transfer as opposed to universal developmental sequences, but also indicate that some other forces are operative as well.

Some patterns were also noted within the groups as well as between groups. In the Beginning ESL group. Subject Q was always the most indirect. In the Intermediate group Subject U always used an Indirect Level 2 directive; and at the advanced level, Subject Y always used a level 1.1 directive.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Japanese ESL learners tend to proceed from less direct to more direct levels in their directive choice. This is the opposite of the sequence of development in L1 English-speaking children, which proceeds from more direct to less direct levels. Thus there tends to be stronger support for the transfer hypothesis than for the universal developmental sequence hypothesis; this support is not unqualified, however, as transfer cannot explain why the advanced students surpass the American controls in degree of directness. This finding suggests that other factors besides transfer appear to be influencing the directive choice.

On the scales, the intermediate group generally more closely resembled the beginning rather than the advanced group. However, the impression of the researchers during the role play was that the intermediate and advanced groups were comparable in terms of proficiency and ease with which they completed the task, while the beginning group had considerably more difficulty. The beginning group took significantly more time to complete the task. While the intermediate and advanced subjects were able to complete the two role plays in less than ten minutes, the beginners usually required more than twenty minutes. The longer length of the role plays resulted in the interviews being considerably longer for the beginning group as well. There were more long hesitations as the beginners groped for words. There also seemed to be more instances of communication breakdown and subsequent repair due to the reduced proficiency.

The advanced group was more efficient in obtaining compliance from the requestee. In Situation 1, the three subjects produced a total of 9 directives as compared to 13 for the beginning group and 14 for the intermediate group. For Situation 2, the advanced group produced only eight directives as compared to 12 for the beginners and 14 for the intermediates. The ESL groups were not compared with the L1 groups on this dimension because different requestees were used for those groups. The requestee in this study apparently gave in more readily than in the L1 studies.

A comment ought to be made about the L1 Japanese bimodal distribution of responses. The Japanese tended to be either very direct or very indirect. This may be accounted for by the fact that the directives at two relatively direct levels, 1.1 and 1.3, contain "honorific" auxiliary verbs and therefore are very polite, although direct. This may encourage Japanese requestors to use the directives at these levels with requestees who are older and have higher social status. In English, these forms are also very direct. However, since there are no honorifics, they are not particularly polite. It is possible that some early learners might use these forms in English because of a lack of pragmatic competence but it does not explain why advanced learners would continue to use these very direct forms to the point of being even more direct than native speakers.

Some methodological issues in this study need to be addressed. First, the issue of identifying directives was somewhat problematic. Sentences such as "Did you finish the questionnaire?" could be interpreted either as an Indirect Level 2 directive or as a pre-request whose intent is to ask for information only. In the original study by Takahashi (1987), both the American and Japanese controls tended to classify such utterances as directives which were then coded as level 2.1. The Japanese ESL learners, on the other hand, tended to classify these sentences as pre-requests which were only intended to ask for information. They did not identify them as directives. Therefore, they were not counted or coded. It is not possible to determine if this difference really reflects an actual difference in the use of the question or merely

in the interpretation of its use by the subjects of the two groups (control and experimental). If it is merely a difference in interpretation, then not all subjects are being compared on their first directives, and the data are confounded by an intervening variable. On the other hand, it is not always possible to identify Indirect Level 2 directives solely on the basis of form and the hearer's interpretation of the question. As Beebe and Takahashi (1989) have discussed, a hearer may interpret an utterance which was merely intended as a comment or a request for information as a request for action. In order to decide which utterances should be classified as directives, a combination approach was used: hearer interpretation and utterance form were used to identify Indirect Level 1 directives; however, speaker intention was used to identify Indirect Level 2 directives.

The taxonomy was found to be a reliable measure for identifying and coding Indirect Level 1 directives because of the conventional forms used at this level. As explained above, other procedures were needed to identify Indirect Level 2 directives; however, once identified, the directives could be reliably coded using the taxonomy. The taxonomy, however, seemed inadequate at Indirect Level 2 in that it failed to distinguish subtle differences in indirectness. As a result, directives which were not equivalent in terms of directness were coded at the same level. While the Indirect Level 1 classification is based on differences in surface level syntactic forms, the Indirect Level 2 classification is semantically based. In order to refine the taxonomy at this level, an investigation into the correlation between the semantic content of the Indirect Level 2 directives generated in both this and the previous study and their tactfulness could be done.

Another necessary step which would then need to be taken would be to validate the taxonomy. The theoretically claimed correlation between tact as a strategy for conflict avoidance and indirectness (Leech, 1980, 1983), needs to be pragmatically proven. One way this might be done is by having native speakers

judge and rank directives according to tact to see how these compare with their ranking on the scale of indirectness.

Another necessary step to be taken is to sort out how indirectness is related to politeness. It is apparent that there is some relationship between the two, and a valid interpretation of results would have to take this relationship into account in order to help sort out the question of cross-linguistic influence in the area of pragmatics.

Any conclusions drawn from this study must be considered tentative as the sample size was quite small. Additional Japanese ESL subjects would need to be tested at each level of proficiency in order to better determine patterns at each level. In addition, subjects from other L1 groups, quite different from Japanese, would need to be similarly tested in order to make a definite determination of the role of the L1 in the pragmatic interlanguage of L2 learners.

NOTES

1. Directives (or directive acts), originally presented by Searle (1976) in his classification of illocutionary acts, include acts like requesting, praying, advising, ordering, inviting, and suggesting, In Blum-Kulka (1982), however, "directives" are narrowly defined and referred to as "requesting."

2. The term directive in Takahashi (1987) is defined as "the illocutionary act by which the speaker attempts to get the hearer to take some action beneficial to the speaker him-herself regardless of the hearer's own wants or interest" (p.61). In short, the term "directives" used in this study are used for "requesting." Hence, for the reader's convenience, in the present study, a "directive performer" is simply described as a "requestor" and a "counterpart of the directive performer" is referred to as a "requestee."

3. None of the subjects from the NICE program have ever taken the TOEFL and other language proficiency tests; they have only taken the placement test administered by the program. Based on the results of their placement test, all the NICE students in this study were assigned to Level 12 (out of 15) in the fluency class. The levels are relative depending upon the proficiency of the students enrolled at any given time, i.e., level 12 this quarter may not be equal to level 12 next quarter. According to their instructor, who has also taught in the ELI, the NICE students are of far lower proficiency in English than the ELI students. In addition, their proficiency in English was judged by the investigators to be equivalent to the beginning level in relation to the other two levels in the present study.

4. With regard to the factors to be specified in describing each situation, the following five factors were considered: the age, sex, social rank/status of the interlocutors, and the social relationship and familiarity between interlocutors. In order to elicit the maximum number of indirect directives, those factors were set in the following way: the participants who were expected to perform directives found it difficult to do so directly because of the hypothesized relationship between them and their co-participants and, as a result, tended to utilize indirect strategies instead.

	Interlocutor performing directive acts in each situation.	Interlocutor responding to directive acts performed by the requestor in each situation.
Age:	younger	older
Sex:	female	female
Social rank/status:	lower (junior)	higher (senior)
Relationship:	neighbors to each other	
Familiarity:	not so familiar with each other	

5. Takahashi (1987) established the taxonomy based on Leech's (1980, 1983) Tact Maxim. Briefly, the taxonomy is interpreted in the following way in the case of directives with the forms of "You should open the window" (Level 1.2), "Will you open the window?" (Level 1.3), and Can you open the window? (Level 1.4)

The directive "Will you open the window?" (Level 1.3) is more tactful than the directive "You should open the window" (Level 1.2) since its yes/no question form overtly allows the hearer to have freedom of response, i.e., the freedom to say "yes" or "no," according to his/her "will" or "desire" to do the requested action. With this directive, however, the hearer does have some difficulty answering, "No, I won't" because such a negative answer will make him/her appear uncooperative and unwilling to carry out his/her part of the interaction. To put it another way, the freedom to refuse is not perfectly guaranteed to the hearer. In this sense, the directive "Can you open the window?" (Level 1.4) is more tactful than "Will you open the window?" in that the speaker gives the hearer the freedom to refuse because the negative answer can be justified by the inability on the part of the hearer to do the desired action.

The Tact Maxim claims a positive correlation between tactfulness and indirectness, i.e., the more tactful forms are more indirect. Hence in the above, "Will you open the window" (Level 1.3) is more indirect than "You should open the window" (Level 1.2) but less indirect than "Can you open the window?" (Level 1.4). Note here that "indirectness" as a result of tactfulness does not necessarily correlate with "politeness." As Leech (1980) claims, the utterance "Would you mind leaving the room?" is a tactful attempt to avoid conflict, but can be extremely impolite on certain occasions. Hence, Takahashi's taxonomy of indirectness excludes the notion of politeness. Also note that this taxonomy is a purely theoretically motivated attempt and some empirical support remains to be obtained.

6. Note that the following two directive intents are different in terms of both the action to be eventually taken and the cost/benefit to the requestee.

> (1) "the daughter should practice the violin at some other time of day."
>
> (2) "The daughter should practice the violin only on specific days of the week. (e.g. on Saturday or on Sunday).

To be more concrete, (1) allows the daughter to practice every day although she cannot play at night, whereas (2) restricts her playing only once or twice a week even though she may be able to practice at night on those specific days. With regard to the degree of cost/benefit to the requestee (actually, the *daughter of the requestee* in this case), it seems that (2) poses a greater degree of cost than (1) does. This is because (2) does not allow

her to practice the violin everyday although "daily practice" is generally considered to be essential for the sound development of playing skill in this area.

References

Banathy, B., E. Trager, & C. Waddle. (1966). The use of contrastive data in foreign language course development. In A. Valdman (ed.), *Trends in language teaching.* New York: Mc Graw-Hill Book Co.

Beebe, L., & T. Takahashi. (1989). "Do you have a bag?": Social status and patterned variation in second language acquisition. In S. Gass, C. Madden, D. Preston, & L. Selinker (eds.), *Variation in second language acquisition: Discourse and pragmatics.* Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Beebe, L.M., T. Takahashi, & R. Uliss-Weltz. (1985). Pragmatic transfer in ESL refusals. Paper presented at TESOL, Anaheim, CA, 1986. A latest version is available in R.C. Scarcella, E. Andersen, and S. Krashen (eds.)(1990), *On the development of communicative competence in a second language.* Rowley, MA: Newbury House

Blom, J.P. & J.J. Gumperz. (1972). Social meaning in linguistic structures: Code-switching in Norway. In J.J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Blum-Kulka, S. (1982). Learning to say what you mean in a second language: A study of speech act performance of learners of Hebrew as a second language. *Applied Linguistics,* 3:1, 29-59.

Boggs, S.T. (1985). *Speaking relating and learning: A study of Hawaiin children at home and at school.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex

Brown, P. & S.C. Levinson. (1978). Universals in language usage: Politeness phenomena. In E.N. Goody (ed.), *Questions and politeness: Strategies in social interaction* (pp. 65-310). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, P. & S.C. Levinson. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Camras, L.A., T.M. Pristo, & M.J.K. Brown. (1985). Directive choice by children and adults: Affect, situation, and linguistic politeness. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly,* 31:1, 19-31.

Cohen, A. & E. Olshtain. (1981). Developing a measure of sociocultural competence: The case of apology. *Language Learning,* 31, 113-134.

Dulay, H. & M. Bart. (1974). Natural sequences in child second language acquisition. *Language Learning,* 24: 37-53.

Eckman, F.R. (1977). Markedness and the contrastive analysis hypothesis. *Language Learning*, 27:2, 315-330.

Eisenstein, M. & J.W. Bodman. (1986). `I very appreciate': Expressions of gratitude by native and non-native speakers of American English. *Applied Linguistics*, 7:2, 167-185.

Ellis, R. (1985). *Understanding second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ervin-Tripp, S. & J. Guo. (in press). Children's request tactics. *Journal of Pragmatics*.

Ervin-Tripp, S., A. Strage, M. Lampert, & N. Bell. (1987). Understanding requests. *Linguistics*, 25, 107-143.

Faerch, C., & G. Kasper. (1989). Internal and external modification in interlanguage request realization. In S. Blum-Kulka, J. House, & G. Kasper (eds.), *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Fraser, B., E. Rintell, & J. Walters. (1980). An approach to conducting research on the acquisition of pragmatic competence in a second language. In D. Larsen-Freeman (ed.), *Discourse analysis in second language research*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Garvey, C. (1975). Requests and responses in children's speech. *Journal of Child Language*, 2, 41-63.

Gass, S. & L. Selinker.(eds.) (1983), *Language transfer in language learning*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Hyltenstam, K. (1977). Implicational patterns in interlanguage syntax variation. *Language Learning*, 27:2, 383-411.

Kasper, G. (1989). Variation in interlanguage speech act realization. In S. Gass, C. Madden, D. Preston, & L. Selinker (eds.), *Variation in second language acquisition: Discourse and pragmatics*. Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Kean, M.L. (1984). Core issues in transfer. In E. Kellerman and M. Sharwood Smith (eds.), *Crosslinguistic influence in second language acquisition*. New York: Pergamon Institute of English.

Kellerman, E. (1977). Towards a characterization of the strategy of transfer in second language learning. *Interlanguage Studies Bulletin Utrecht*, 2:1, 58-145.

Kellerman, E. (1978). Giving learners a break: Native intuitions as a source of predictions about transferability. *Working Papers on Bilingualism*, No. 15, March.

Kellerman, E. (1984). The empirical evidence for the influence of the L1 in interlanguage. In A. Davies,C. Criper, & A.P.R. Howatt (eds.), *Interlanguage* (pp.98-122). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Kellerman, E. & M. Sharwood Smith. (1986). Crosslinguistic influence in second language acquisition: An introduction. In E. Kellerman & M. Sharwood Smith (eds.),*Crosslinguistic influence in second language acquisition.* New York: Pergamon Press.

Labov, W. (1966). *The social stratification of English in New York City.* Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Ladousse, G.P. (1987). *Role play.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Larsen-Freeman, Diane, & M.H. Long. (in press). *An Introduction to second language acquisition research.* London: Longman.

Leech, G. (1980). *Explorations in semantics and pragmatics.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins B.V.

Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics.* New York: Longman

Liebling, C. R. (1988). Means to an end: Children's knowledge of directives during the elementary school years. *Discourse Processes,* 11:1, 79-99.

Morgan, J. (1978). Two types of convention in indirect speech acts. In P. Cole (ed.), *Syntax and semantics, Volume 9: Pragmatics.* New York: Academic Press.

Nippold, M. A., L. B. Leonard, & A. Anastopoulos. (1982). Development in the use and understanding of polite forms in children. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research,* 25:2, 193-202

Olshtain, E. (1983). Sociocultural competence and language transfer: The case of apology. In S. Gass & L. Selinker (eds.), *Language transfer in language learning.* Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Read, B. K., & L. J. Cherry. (1978). Preschool children's production of directive forms. *Discourse Processes,* 1, 233-245.

Searle. J. (1975). Indirect speech acts. In P. Cole & J. Morgan (eds.), *Syntax and semantics, Volume 3: Speech acts.* New York: Academic Press.

Stockwell, R., J.D. Bowen, & J.W. Martin. (1965). *The Grammatical structures of English and Spanish.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Takahashi, S. (1987). *A contrastive study of indirectness exemplified in L1 directive speech acts performed by Americans and Japanese*. Unpublished MA Thesis, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL.

Wardhaugh, R. (1970). The contrastive analysis hypothesis. *TESOL Quarterly*, 4: 123-130.

Wolfson, N. (1989). *Perspectives*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Wolfson, N., T. Marmor, & S. Jones. (1989). Problems in the comparison of speech acts across cultures. In S. Blum-Kulka, J. House, & G. Kasper (eds.), *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Zobl, H. (1982). A direction for contrastive analysis: The comparative study of developmental sequences. *TESOL Quarterly*, 16, 169-183.

Appendix A

Taxonomy developed by Takahashi (1987)

(H = hearer, S = speaker, A = act/action)

		Rank	Level	Descriptions/Representative Forms
Direct	Directives	1	0.0	**Imperatives** (English) / (Japanese) Open the window. — Mado wo ake-nasai, ake-ro, You will open the window. — ake-te kudasai.
Indirect	Directives Indirect Level 1	2	1.1	**Sentences stating S's wish or want that H will do A.** (English) / (Japanese) I want (would like) you to open the window. — Mado wo ake-te morai tai, ake-te itadaki tai. *Statement of Want* I want a pencil. — Empitsu ga hoshii no desu. I want to borrow a pencil. — Empitsu wo kari-tai no desu (ga).
		3	1.2	**Sentences stating S's expectation of H's doing A.** (English) / (Japanese) You can open the window. — (Anata nara) mado wo ake-rare masu (yo). You should open the window. — Mado wo akeru-beki desu.
		4	1.3	**Sentences asking H's will, desire, or willingness to do A.** (English) / (Japanese) Will/Won't you open the window? / Would you open the window? / Would you be willing to open the window? / Would you mind opening the window? Rank 4a: Lv.1.3.1 Mado wo ake-te kure masu ka, Mado wo ake-te kudasai masu ka. Rank 4b: Lv.1.3.2 Mado wo ake-te morae masu ka, Mado wo ake-te itadake masu ka.

Directives — Indirect — Indirect Level 1

5	1.4	**Sentences asking H's ability to do A.** (English): Can/Can't you open the window? Could/Couldn't you open the window? (Japanese): Mado wo ake-rare masu ka, Mado wo akeru koto deki masu ka.
6	1.5	**Sentences asking reasons for H's not doing A.** (English): Why don't you open the window? Don't you have to open the window? (Japanese): Dooshite mado wo akenai no desu ka.
7	1.6	**Sentences asking H's permission for S's requesting H to do A.** (English): Can (May) I ask you to open the window? (Japanese): Mado wo ake-te kudasaru yoo onegai deki masu ka.
8	1.7	**Interrogative sentences embedding one of the clauses/gerunds concerning H's doing A.** (English): Do you think that you can open the window? How about opening the window? (Japanese): Mado wo ake-rareru to omoi mase-n ka. Mado wo ake-te wa ikaga desu ka.
9	1.8	**Declarative sentences questioning H's doing A.** (English): I wonder if you could open the window. (Japanese): Mado wo ake-rare ru ka doo ka to omoi mashite.
10	1.9	**Sentences concerning S's expectation of H's doing A in hypothetical situations.** (English): I would appreciate it if you would open the window. (Japanese): Mado wo ake-te itadakeru to arigatai no desu ga.

Directives — Indirect — Indirect Level 2

11 2.1 **Interrogative sentences with implicit reference to the action.**

(English)	(Japanese)
Are we out of coffee?	Rank 11a: Lv.2.1.1
What are you laughing at?	Onegai deki mase-n desho ka.
May (Can) I have some coffee?	Rank 11b: Lv.2.1.2
*Should you close the window?	Interrogative sentences other than the above.
*Intent: Don't close the window.	

2.2 **Declarative sentences with implicit reference to the action.**

12 2.2.1 **Sentences manifesting S's literal implication.**

Rank 12: Lv. 2.2.1-1

(English)	(Japanese)
Need Statement	*Need Statement*
I need a pencil.	Empitsu ga iru no desu.
I need to borrow a pencil.	Empitsu ga hitsuyoona no desu.
	Onegai itashi masu.
	Onegai shitai no desu ga.

Rank 12+: Lv. 2.2.1-2

(English) (Japanese)

Declarative sentences other than the above.

e.g.) My mouth is parched.

13 2.2.2 **Sentences manifesting S's non-literal implication.**

(English) (Japanese)

- Ironical expressions

e.g.) I am sure the cat likes having its tail pulled.

Appendix B

SITUATION 1

YOU are Sachiko Suzuki, a student at the University of Hawaii.

The daughter of Mrs. Janet Burns, Peggy (a junior high school student), has started taking violin lessons. It is fine for Peggy to learn to play the violin, but she always begins to practice playing the violin after eleven o'clock at night. Therefore, you (a senior student at UH) and your younger sister, Yuko (a junior at UH), who live in an apartment house next door to the Burns, are suffering from insomnia. No one in your neighborhood has complained to Mrs. Burns about Peggy's violin playing, however. After a while, you decide to ask Mrs. Burns to take some action about Peggy's night practice.

SITUATION 2

YOU are Hitomi Hasegawa, a student at the University of Hawaii.

You must hand in a research paper for a psychology course. Your topic is "On the Mental Stress Experienced by the Businesswomen in Management Positions." You are going to support your research using the survey technique of distributing questionnaires among a number of businesswomen in management positions in Honolulu.

Since your neighbor, Mrs. Mary Williams, is in a management position at Central Bank, you asked her to fill out the questionnaire for you. Your questionnaire was a two-page-long yes/no-answer type, so you expected Mrs. Williams to return it within a few days. But there has not been any response from Mrs. Williams for almost two weeks. Your paper is due within four days. Since there are only a small number of women managers with banking experience, you really need Mrs. Williams' response. So you decide to ask Mrs. Williams to fill out your questionnaire and return it as soon as possible.

SITUATION 1

あなたはスズキ・サチコで、ハワイ大学の学生（4年生）です。

状況：
ジャネット・バーンズ夫人の娘のペギー（中学生）が、最近バイオリンを習い始めました。ペギーがバイオリンを練習することは一向にさしつかえないのですが、困ったことには、ペギーは毎晩11時過ぎ頃になってから練習を始めるのです。その為、隣りのアパートで、妹のユウコ（大学3年生）と二人で暮らしているあなたは、妹共々、不眠症にかかりそうです。あいにく、同じアパートの住人も含め、近所の者は誰もバーンズ夫人に苦情を言いに行きません。そこで、あなたは、バーンズ夫人に、ペギーの夜のバイオリン練習をどうにかしてもらう旨を頼みに行くことにしました。

SITUATION 2

あなたは、ハセガワ・ヒトミで、ハワイ大学の学生（3年生）です。

状況：
あなたは、大学の心理学のクラスで、レポートを提出しなくてはなりません。あなたのトピックは、『管理職に携わるビジネス・ウーマンの心理的ストレスについて』です。あなたは、ホノルルのオフィス街で働く、管理職地位にある女性達にアンケート調査をすることで、このレポートをまとめようと思っています。幸い、隣りに住むマリー・ウイリアムズ夫人が、ホノルルのセントラル・バンクで、ある管理職についている為、あなたは、さっそくアンケート記入を頼みに行きました。このアンケートは2ページにわたる『はい／いいえ』式の簡単なものである為、あなたは、ウイリアムズ夫人が2－3日の内にでも記入して返してくれるものと思っていました。ところが、2週間たった今日まで何の返答もありません。このレポートの締切日は4日後です。銀行関係の管理職についている女性の数はほんのわずかな為、あなたは是非ともウイリアムズ夫人にアンケートを記入してもらわなくてはならないと思っています。そこで、あなたは、ウイリアムズ夫人に早く記入して返してくれるよう、再度、頼みに行くことにしました。

SITUATION 1 (for REQUESTEE)

YOU are Mrs. Janet Burns. (in your mid 30s)

You have a daughter, Peggy, who is a junior high school student. Peggy has been interested in playing the violin and has started taking lessons recently, but she cannot begin to practice playing the violin until around eleven o'clock every night since she is so busy. (After school, she either has to work or go to basketball practices every day until 8:00 pm.) Therefore, you allow her to practice the violin around that time at night although you are concerned about your neighbor's response to your daughter's night practice.

You have a neighbor, Sachiko Suzuki (a senior Japanese student at UH), who lives in an apartment house next door to you with her younger sister, Yuko (a junior student at UH).

SITUATION 2 (for REQUESTEE)

YOU are Mrs. Mary Williams. (in your late 30s)

You work for Central Bank in Honolulu and are in a management position.

About two weeks ago, you were asked by Hitomi Hasegawa (a Japanese student at UH), your next-door neighbor, to fill out a two-page-long questionnaire about the mental stress experienced by the businesswomen in management positions. According to Hitomi, she must hand in a research paper for a psychology course at UH, and she wanted to support her paper using the survey technique of distributing questionnaires among a number of businesswomen in management positions in Honolulu. Since you have been extremely busy working at the bank these two weeks, however, , you have not yet filled out Hitomi's questionnaire. Above all, you will have been busy working overtime for about one week. Therefore, you are thinking of doing Hitomi's questionnaire one week from now after your busy days have passed.

Appendix C

GENERAL BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Please answer the following questions.

Name: _____ Age: _____
(Phone #:) Year in school: _____

Currently enrolled in: NICE / HELP / ELI / Other
(Please circle one)

TOEFL score (if available) : _____
(Test Date:)

1) How long have you been in Hawaii?

2) How long have you studied in Hawaii?

3) How often a week do you talk with English native speakers in English outside the class?
(Please circle one.)

1 hour or below / 2-4 hours / 5-7 hours / 8 hours or above

4) Are you living with a native speaker of English here?

If "yes," how long? _____ year(s) _____ month(s)

5 Have you ever been to the mainland US or any other foreign countries?

If "yes," when? _____

where? _____

how long? _____

6) How long did you study English in Japan? Please specify the period.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

7) Have you ever had any lessons for English conversation in Japan?

If "yes," where? _____

how long? _____
(from to)

Was/Were your instructor(s) Japanese or (a) native speaker(s) of English?

8) What are you going to do after you complete your current study here?

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR PARTICIPATING IN OUR STUDY!

BEST COPY AVAILABLE